

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 4-5, 9-10, 13-16 and 18 are amended for clarity and new claims 21-34 are added. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action objects to the drawings because they do not include reference characters mentioned in the description. The specification has been amended to reference the bit lines and bit line pairs referenced in the Office Action. No new matter is added. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by U.S. Patent 4,567,577 to Oliver. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a bias transistor coupled to a body of one of the transistors of the first transistor pair and to a body of one of the transistors of the second transistor pair, the bias transistor to apply a forward body bias to the one transistor of the first transistor pair and to the one transistor of the second transistor pair based on a non-ACTIVE mode/state.

Oliver does not teach or suggest all these features of independent claim 1. In particular, the Office Action asserts that Oliver's transistor 35 corresponds to the claimed bias transistor. However, Oliver shows that when the WRITE line is inactive, then the transistor 35 has its gate activated. This results in a voltage of VSS being applied to bodies of transistors 25 and 27, "causing them to function as normal n-channel devices." However, this does not suggest to

apply a forward body bias since the transistors are already being supplied with a supply voltage of VSS. Therefore, Oliver does not teach or suggest a bias transistor coupled to a body of one of the transistors of the first transistor pair and to a body of one of the transistors of the second transistor pair, the bias transistor to apply a forward body bias to the one transistor of the first transistor pair and to the one transistor of the second transistor pair based on a non-ACTIVE mode/state. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Still further, dependent claim 5 recites that the supply voltage line to receive a first supply voltage based on a first mode of the memory device and to receive a second supply voltage based on a second mode of the memory device, the second voltage being different than the first supply voltage. Oliver does not teach or suggest these features as Oliver receives the same supply voltage VSS (for transistors 25 and 27) regardless of the mode of the memory device. Thus, dependent claim 5 defines patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

Dependent claim 6 relates to a STANDBY signal. However, Oliver's WRITE signal signal being inactive does not correspond to a STANDBY signal indicative of a STANDBY state of a memory device. This is, the present application clearly describes a STANDBY signal and a STANDBY state of a memory device. One skilled in the art would clearly know that Oliver's WRITE signal or lack of WRITE signal does not correspond to a STANDBY signal indicative of a STANDBY state of a memory device. Rather, Oliver's WRITE signal merely relates to whether data is being written. The lack of a WRITE signal is not a STANDBY state of a

memory device. Thus, dependent claim 6 defines patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

Independent claim 9 also defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. That is, independent claim 9 recites a supply voltage line to provide a first supply voltage to two transistors of the first SRAM memory cell based on a first mode of the first SRAM memory cell and to provide a second supply voltage to the two transistors based on a second mode of the first SRAM memory cell. Independent claim 9 also recites a switching device to apply a forward body bias to the two transistors of the cross-coupled inverter configuration of the first SRAM memory cell.

Oliver does not provide a supply voltage to two transistors of the first SRAM memory cell based on a mode of a SRAM device. Rather, Oliver clearly shows VSS being applied to transistors 25 and 27 and VDD being applied to transistors 24 and 29. Accordingly, independent claim 9 defines patentable subject matter.

Dependent claim 10 further recites a power control unit to change the supply voltage on the supply voltage line based on the mode of the first SRAM memory cell. Oliver does not teach or suggest a power control unit to change the supply voltage on the supply line based on the mode of the first SRAM memory cell. Rather, Oliver provides VSS to transistors 25 and 27 and provides VDD to transistors 24 and 29.

Independent claim 18 also defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons as set forth above. That is, independent claim 18 recites a power control unit to control a supply voltage level applied to the SRAM device and to provide a signal indicative of a mode of the

SRAM device. Independent claim 18 also recites the SRAM device including a switching device to apply a forward bias to transistors within the SRAM device based on the signal provided by the power control unit indicative of the mode. Oliver does not teach or suggest these features for at least similar reasons as set forth above. Accordingly, independent claim 18 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 9 and 18 define patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. For example, applicants have addressed several of these dependent claims above in an attempt to show how the Office Action has not addressed these features or that Oliver does not teach or suggest the respective features. Dependent claims 21-34 also recite additional features.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-34 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David C. Oren**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. 10/812,894
Reply to Office Action of July 15, 2005

Docket No. INTEL-0056

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and
please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DCO/knv/kah

Date: August 31, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610